REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action of February 9, 2005, applicant submits the following remarks.

Claims 1 - 36 are pending, with claims 1, 10, 13, 19, 28, and 31 being independent. Claims 13 and 31 have been amended. No new mater has been added. In particular, supported for the amended claims in found in the applications at page 2, lines 14 - 15 and a page 9, lines 16 - 25.

Rejections Under § 102

Claims 1 - 4, 10, 12, 19 - 22, 28, and 30 have been rejected as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,374,402 ("Schmeidler"). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Schmeidler does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of processing a data stream with a computer system. Independent claim 19 recites a computer program for processing a data stream with a computer system. As recited in claims 1 and 19, the data stream is received using a browser application, and a content type of data in the data stream is detected. A default rendering process otherwise associated with the content type detected for the data in the data stream is temporarily overridden by associating a particular rendering process with the data stream based on the type of data in the data stream, and the data stream is routed to the particular rendering process.

For example, a non-limiting example described in the detailed description at pages 6 - 7, indicates explains that a particular content type (e.g., a sound file or a video file), when received by a browser, can be exported to a media player, such as RealNetworks RealPlayer® or Microsoft Windows Media Player® for rendering to the user. A Window® registry maintains a mapping between content types and the default media player used to render the data of that content type. However, the default media player (e.g., Microsoft Windows Media Player®) can be overridden temporarily by associating a particular media player (e.g., RealNetworks RealPlayer®) with the data stream. Application at page 6, line 25 - page 7, line 18. Thus, an

internal instance of a browser can be route a data stream to a particular media player without altering the Windows® registry that stores the user's preference of a default media player to be used by external instances of the browser. Id.

In contrast, Schmeidler relates to secure content delivery of on-demand content from a host computer to a client computer. A user operating a client computer purchases access to content, and a digitally-signed launch string is provided to the user. Col. 9:21-35. The launch string is wrapped with a MIME header, and when a browser running on the client computer receives the launch string, the MIME type associated with the launch string is located in a registry entry, which results in the invocation of a launcher module with the client. Col. 9:35-41. See also, col. 10:47-51. After purchase of the content, a launcher mounts a file system and stores associated registry entries on the local drive of the host system. Col 16:13-17. After execution of the content, locally-stored registry entries and any data blocks that have been cached locally can be erased or over written. Col. 16:57-59. Thus, no evidence remains on the client system that the content ran on the client system. Col. 15:47-52. Apparently, this system enables the rendering of content on the client system without ever installing the content on the client, and thereby prevents unauthorized copying of the content. Col. 2:4-18.

Although, Schmeidler discloses overwriting locally-stored registry entries after the content has been executed, Schmeidler does not disclose or suggest "temporarily overriding a default rendering process otherwise associated with the content type detected for the data in the data stream by associating a particular rendering process with the data stream based on the type of data in the data stream," as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Schmeidler makes no mention of rendering the content with a different rendering process than a default process or of temporarily overriding a default rendering process. The Examiner apparently equates overwriting locally-stored registry entries with "temporarily overriding a default rendering process . . . ," but Schmeidler provides no link between the rendering process used to render the purchased content and the registry entries, and Schmeidler does not suggest using a rendering process other than a default process for the content. Thus, Schmeidler does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1 or 19.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection an allowance of claims 1 and 19. Claims 2 - 4 and claims 20 - 22 depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons the independent claims are allowable.

Similarly, Schmeidler also does not disclose or suggest directing a data stream away from a data process designated as a default by the computer system based on the data type identified for the data stream as recited in independent claims 10 and 28. Specifically, independent claim 10, recites a method of processing a data stream with a computer system, and independent claim 28 recites a computer program for processing a data stream with a computer system. As recited in claims 10 and 28, the data stream is received using a browser application, and a stream type for the data stream is identified. The data stream is directed away from a data process designated as a default by the computer system based on the data type identified for the data stream. As explained above, Schmeidler fails to disclose or suggest directing a data stream away from a data process designated as a default by the computer system based on the data type identified for the data stream.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection an allowance of claims 10 and 28. Claim 12 and claim 30 depend from claims 10 and 28, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons the independent claims are allowable.

Claims 13 - 18 and claims 31 - 36 have been rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,009,462 ("Birrell"). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Birrell does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 13 or 31.

Amended independent claim 13 recites a method that includes calling a data stream using a browser running on a computer system and detecting a first type of data associated with the data stream called by the browser. The first type of data is redefined as a second type of data, and the data stream is automatically rendered with a second rendering process based on the second type of data. The second rendering process is different than a first rendering process that would be used to automatically render the data stream based on the first data type.

Applicant : John Robinson   Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-153001 / Multimedia 16
Serial No. : 09/971,086
Filed   : October 5, 2001
Page   : 12 of 13

Birrell discloses a method of downloading mail messages in a distributed computer system. Abstract. The method manages the quantity of mail messages by recognizing files attached to mail messages (e.g., image, video, and audio files) and can hold back these large attachments, yet replace the attachments with a hot-link in the mail message through which the user can access the attached files. Col. 12:59 - col. 13:7. However, Birrell does not disclose or suggest redefining a first type of data as a second type of data and then automatically rendering the data with a rending process. Rather, "[o]nly when the user clicks one of the hot-links 1031 is the components [sic] sent to the requesting client computer." Col. 13:5-7.

Thus, Birrell does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 13 or 31.

For at least these reasons, applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection an allowance of claims 13 and 31. Claims 14 - 18 and claims 32 - 36 depend from claims 13 and 31, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons the independent claims are allowable.

Rejections Under § 103

Claims 5-8, 11, 23-26, and 29 have been rejected as allegedly obvious over Schmeidler in view of U.S. patent No. 6,564,255 ("Mobini"). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither Schmeidler nor Mobini, alone or in combination, discloses the subject matter of the claims.

As explained above, Schmeidler does not disclose or suggest temporarily overriding a default rendering process otherwise associated with the content type detected for the data in the data stream by associating a particular rendering process with the data stream based on the type of data in the data stream or directing a data stream away from a data process designated as a default by the computer system based on the data type identified for the data stream, as recited in claims 1 and 10, respectively. Mobini does not cure the deficiencies of Schmiedler.

Mobini relates to a method and apparatus for accessing DVD bitstream content. Title. The method and apparatus uses separate DVD and HTML browsers to render DVD and HTML data, and the different data types are automatically rendered in the appropriate browser. Col.

7:10-42. However, Mobini does not disclose or suggest temporarily overriding a default rendering process or directing a data stream away form a data process designated as a default.

Thus, neither Schmeidler nor Mobini discloses the subject matter of independent claims 1, 10, 19, or 28. Claims 5-8 and 23-26 depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively and are allowable at least for the reasons the independent claims are allowable. Claims 11 and 29 depend from claims 10 and 28, respectively and are allowable at least for the reasons the independent claims are allowable.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 06975-153001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/09/05

Mark R.W. Bellermann
Reg. No. 47,419

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40279742.doc